

Docket No.: 42P16345

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending in the case. Claims 11-13 are allowed, and claims 3-5, 8, 16-18, 21, and 25 were deemed allowable but objected to as depending from rejected base claims. The remaining claims are rejected. As described further below, Applicants traverse the rejections and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance.

Based on the arguments set forth herein, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claim 15 asserting that “to have” apparently should be “having.” In accordance with this objection, claim 15 has been amended.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 14, 22, and 23 are rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,346,895 to Lee et al. (Lee). Claims 2, 6, 7, 9, 10, 15, 19, 20, 24, 26, and 27 are rejected as being obvious over Lee. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. Lee’s use of continuously transmitting data that has been encoded to achieve sufficient bit transition is fundamentally different from Applicants’ intermittently transmitted retraining flits. Independent claims 1, 14, 22, and 26 have been amended to more clearly point out this feature. Accordingly, all of the pending claims are allowable over Lee, and a Notice of Allowance is requested.

As with Applicants’ methodology, the Lee reference discloses a solution to ensure that a minimum transition density is attained. However, unlike Applicants’ scheme, Lee relies on continuously transmitting encoded data units to ensure that sufficient bit transition occurs, i.e., within every transmitted data unit. Lee teaches an $n:(n+1)$ coding scheme wherein each n -bit

Docket No.: 42P16345

data unit is coded with an $(n+1)$ -bit code word, which can be made to have a sufficient number of transitions. As recognized by the Examiner, the encoding scheme works by determining the number of transitions in an $(n+1)$ pre-code word, and if the number would be less than $n/2$, then alternate bits are inverted to provide for sufficient transitioning. Whether or not the alternate bits have been inverted is encoded in the $(n+1)^{\text{th}}$ bit. In contrast with the Examiner's contention, however, this is not a retraining flit. Rather, it is encoding every data unit to ensure that each data unit has sufficient transitioning so that the overall bit stream has sufficient transitioning.

With Applicants' scheme, however, the transmitted data units don't have to be encoded to meet the minimal transition criteria. Instead, a separate retraining flit (containing a suitable number of bit transitions) is intermittently (regular or irregular intervals) transmitted in between transmitted data units to synchronize the receiver to the transmitter clock on a non-continual basis before they drift too far apart.

Thus, Lee fails to teach or even suggest the use of a retraining flit, and the claims should be allowed.

Docket No.: 42P16345

CONCLUSION

Applicants assert that all claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to pass this case to issue at the Examiner's earliest possible convenience.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512/238-7253.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 6, 2006

/Erik Nordstrom, Reg. No. 39,792/

Erik R. Nordstrom
Registration No. 39,792

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030
408-720-8300